

**Questions & Answers III**  
**To**  
**Solicitation Number DAMT01-03-R-0047**

1. C.1.2.1 Regional Concept No. 2 "The contractor must have the capability to meet US and Canadian Customs requirements for shipments to and from Canada." In "Schedule B" there is only a pricing area for freight going into Canada ( i.e. Region 2 to Region 0) but no pricing structure for freight originating in Region 0 back to the CONUS Where in Canada is the freight going? Canada is a big country. Are there specific addresses that freight moves to and from Canada?

Answer. The requirement is written to cover only shipments delivered to Canada, not shipments out of Canada. While we do not have specific addresses for freight moving to Canada, the primary delivery locations within Canada are:

Winnipeg, MB  
Mississauga, ON  
Ville St Laurent, PQ  
Kanata, ON  
Halifax, NS  
Montreal, PQ  
Quebec, PQ  
Richmond, BC  
Stratford, ON  
Toronto, ON

2. I have been looking at the new information released today on the MTMC website. The ATAC data sheet details 13.5 million pounds of freight, but the new Schedule B sums to 18.8 million pounds per year. What period of time does the ATAC data sheet cover?

Answer. The ATAC data sheet covers 9 months of data, while the Schedule B represents 12 months of data.

3. At the bidders' conference, we were told that the schedule B region tables included the local shipments, and that the local history would be removed from the regional pricing table. The new Schedule B has exactly the same shipment history as the old one. Does the ATAC data sheet include the local shipment history?

Answer. Yes

3(a). Or has that history been removed? Will the Schedule B be further amended to exclude the local shipments from the regional table? If the ATAC data sheet is a year of history, which information is correct, the data sheet or the pricing sheet?

Answer. We were able to gather some local delivery data (see Volume 2, question #7). It was not and will not be deducted from Schedule B, as we do not have the detailed breakdown that would allow us to deduct it.

4. I understand that the cut-off date for questions for this solicitation was 16 July 2003, but since the solicitation was not posted on FedBizOpps until 23 July 2003, I would like to ask a few additional questions.

Answer. The cut-off date of 16 Jul 03 was established for questions to be responded to at the pre-proposal conference. Amendment 0004 establishes a new date for the submission of questions. The purpose of establishing a date for the submission of final questions is to allow the Government sufficient time in which to respond prior to the closing date of the solicitation.

5. The SF1449 states that this solicitation was released 07 July 2003, yet it was not posted until 23 July 2003. Will the offer due date be adjusted to reflect the actual posting date?

Answer. See amendment 4 which extended the due date to 26 August 2003.

6. Page 4 lists a pre-proposal conference and site visit. Where can I find the questions and answers posted from this conference?

Answer. MTMC web site.

7. Reference Paragraph C.4.6.10.3 Hard copy proof of delivery. In your response to a previous question on this subject you stated that at a minimum a copy of each 1348-1 with a doc id of BC-1 must be captured. The BC-1 is a document used by the shipper to turn over material to ATAC. The contractor will only be exposed to BC-1 documents at the East Coast locations where he picks up and delivers on a daily basis. Even then he will not see all of these documents. Direct turnovers (walk-ins) to node/hub locations by shippers will not pass through the contractor's control. It is our understanding that all BC-1 documents are scanned into the AORS system anyway. Therefore is the contractor responsible for scanning BC-1 documents into his imaging system at all or just POD for delivered shipments?

Answer. Contractor must be able to provide proof of acceptance from turn-in customer. Image retrieval is required for reproducing hard copy of POD information. Direct turnover of material from a customer to the government releases the contractor from proof of turnover/acceptance requirements.

8. In the course of preparing the Technical Proposal, Vol. II we find that the complexity and scope of the ATAC work makes it impossible to adequately address given the 50 page limitation for the volume - even with resumes and the QC manual excluded. Will the Government raise this limit to 100 or 75 pages?

Answer. No.

9. You mention that award is scheduled for 1<sup>st</sup>. Quarter FY-04. Question, how long a time period will be allowed between award and start of performance? In other words, when do you anticipate start of performance on this contract?

Answer. 30 Days.

10. Will any minutes or attendance list of the pre-proposal conference and site visits be published?

Answer. No

11. We are trying to reconcile the numbers of shipment and weights between the ATAC Data Spreadsheet included with Amendment 2 and the Revised Schedule B numbers for this contract. We are using option years because they are annualized numbers and presumably the spreadsheet was also. As you can see, there is quite a disparity between the two sets of numbers. Total shipment numbers are over 25% off. Can you please explain the disparity. Do they have to do with local deliveries or material not to be handled by the contractor, overseas shipments of what?

**SCHEDULE B (FIRST OPTION YEAR)**

	<b>1-150</b>	<b>151-499</b>	<b>500-1999</b>	<b>2000-up</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>SHIPMENTS</b>	95,937	9,369	4,502	1,265	111,073
<b>WEIGHT</b>	3,108,684	3,142,968	4,757,533	7,872,677	18,881,862

#### **ATAC DATA SPREADSHEET**

	<b>1-150</b>	<b>151-499</b>	<b>500-1999</b>	<b>2000-up</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>SHIPMENTS</b>	69,752	6,839	3,980	898	81,469
<b>WEIGHT</b>	2,273,834	2,315,093	3,473,435	5,475,639	13,538,001

The reason for the disparity, as stated above, is that the ATAC Data Spreadsheet covers nine months of data, while the Schedule B represents 12 months of data.

12. Has there been any response posted to the many questions asked at the meeting on 21 July ?

Answer. Yes. See Q & A I, II, and III posted on MTMC web site.

13. Schedule B1: The extended price formula for the option years is not correct. Please modify

Answer. See amendment 3 and Schedule B2 posted on MTMC web site.